PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

То:	CHING AUTHORITY		
MICHAEL E. WHITHAM WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, PC 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, SUITE 340			PCT
RESTON, VA 20190	OAD, SUITE 340	V V	RITTEN OPINION OF THE
		INTERNAT	IONAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT
			(PCT Rule 43bis.1)
		Date of mailing (day/month/year	13 FEB 2006
Applicant's or agent's file	reference	FOR FURTHER	RACTION
02940350TA			See paragraph 2 below
International application N	o. International filing	date (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/US05/11544	07 April 2005 (07	04.2005)	
International Patent Classif	ication (IPC) or both national class	sification and IPC	08 April 2004 (08.04.2004)
IPC(7): A61B 6/03 and US	Cl.: 600/425, 428		
Applicant			
VIRGINIA COMMONWE	ALTH UNIVERSITY		
1. This opinion contains is	ndications relating to the following	itoma	
Box No. I	Basis of the opinion	items:	
Box No. II	Priority		
Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with	th regard to novelty, inver	ntive step and industrial applicability
Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	27	o step and industrial applicability
Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 4	3bis,1(a)(i) with regard to	novelty, inventive step or industrial
	7, Chanons and explan	ations supporting such sta	atement
Box No. VI	Certain documents cited		
	Certain defects in the international	l application	
Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the interna-	ational application	
2. FURTHER ACTION			
IC - I. IC	ional proliminant		
Authority other than this	Examining Authority ("IPEA") one to be the IPEA and the chose is International Searching Authori	the pri that this does i	e considered to be a written opinion of the not apply where the applicant chooses an International Bureau under Rule 66.1 <i>bis(b)</i> ed.
Authority other than this that written opinions of the lift this opinion is, as proving IPEA a written reply together.	one to be the IPEA and the choss is International Searching Authorivided above, considered to be a wither where appropriate to the considered to be a wither where appropriate to the considered to be a wither where appropriate to the considered to	en IPEA has notified the ty will not be so considered ritten opinion of the IPE	International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) ed. A, the applicant is invited to submit to the
Authority other than this that written opinions of the lift this opinion is, as provided a written reply toge of Form PCT/ISA/220 or	one to be the IPEA and the chose is International Searching Authorical vided above, considered to be a wither, where appropriate, with ame before the expiration of 22 months	en IPEA has notified the ty will not be so considered ritten opinion of the IPE	International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) ed. A, the applicant is invited to submit to the
Authority other than this that written opinions of the lift this opinion is, as proving the awritten reply toge of Form PCT/ISA/220 or For further options, see Form	one to be the IPEA and the choss is International Searching Authority and above, considered to be a wither, where appropriate, with ame before the expiration of 22 months orm PCT/ISA/220.	en IPEA has notified the ty will not be so considered ritten opinion of the IPE	International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) ed. A, the applicant is invited to submit to the
Authority other than this that written opinions of the lift this opinion is, as proving IPEA a written reply toge of Form PCT/ISA/220 or For further options, see Form	one to be the IPEA and the choss is International Searching Authority and above, considered to be a wither, where appropriate, with ame before the expiration of 22 months orm PCT/ISA/220.	en IPEA has notified the ty will not be so considered ritten opinion of the IPE	International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) ed. A, the applicant is invited to submit to the
Authority other than this that written opinions of the lift this opinion is, as provided a written reply toge of Form PCT/ISA/220 or For further options, see For further details, see note the me and mailing address of the lift that written is the second of the lift that written is the lift that	one to be the IPEA and the choss is International Searching Authorical International I	en IPEA has notified the ty will not be so considered the ritten opinion of the IPE and ments, before the expirit from the priority date, where the priority date is the priority date.	International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) ed. A, the applicant is invited to submit to the ration of 3 months from the date of mailing nichever expires later.
Authority other than this that written opinions of the lift this opinion is, as provided a written reply toge of Form PCT/ISA/220 or For further options, see Form further details, see note that the lift is address of the lift mail Stop PCT, Atm: IS.	one to be the IPEA and the choss is International Searching Authorical International Search International Internat	en IPEA has notified the ty will not be so considered the ritten opinion of the IPE indiments, before the expirit from the priority date, where the priority date is the priority date.	International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) ed. A, the applicant is invited to submit to the ration of 3 months from the date of mailing nichever expires later.
Authority other than this that written opinions of the lift this opinion is, as provided a written reply toge of Form PCT/ISA/220 or For further options, see Form further details, see note the me and mailing address of the lift that written is the second of the lift that written is the lift that	one to be the IPEA and the choss is International Searching Authorical International I	en IPEA has notified the ty will not be so considered the ritten opinion of the IPE indiments, before the expirit from the priority date, where the priority date is the priority date.	International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) ed. A, the applicant is invited to submit to the ration of 3 months from the date of mailing nichever expires later.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US05/11544

	No. I Basis of this opinion
L. With	regard to the lenguage of the second
\boxtimes	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	the international application in the language in which it was filed
	a translation of the international application into, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
. With inven	regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
a.	type of material
	a sequence listing
	table(s) related to the sequence listing
b.	format of material
	on paper
	in electronic form
c.	time of filing/furnishing
	contained in the international application as filed.
	filed together with the international application in electronic form.
1	
	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
a	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
- Sumon	an confinents.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US05/11544

Novelty (N) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Inventive step (IS) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Italian NONE	N
Claims NONE Inventive step (IS) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Itations and explanations: Ins 1-15 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest g in four-dimensional computed tomography to pause data acquisition during periods of irregular breathing.	N
Inventive step (IS) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Itations and explanations: Ins 1-15 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest g in four-dimensional computed tomography to pause data acquisition during periods of irregular breathing.	Y
Claims NONE Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Itations and explanations: Ins 1-15 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest g in four-dimensional computed tomography to pause data acquisition during periods of irregular breathing.	N
Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE Itations and explanations: Institutions and explanations: Institutions are contained as a second of the contained as a second of th	N
Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-15 Claims NONE itations and explanations: Ins 1-15 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest g in four-dimensional computed tomography to pause data acquisition during periods of irregular breathing.	v
Claims NONE itations and explanations: ns 1-15 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest g in four-dimensional computed tomography to pause data acquisition during periods of irregular breathing.	Y
itations and explanations: ns 1-15 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest g in four-dimensional computed tomography to pause data acquisition during periods of irregular breathing.	N
ns 1-15 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest g in four-dimensional computed tomography to pause data acquisition during periods of irregular breathing.	
ns 1-15 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest g in four-dimensional computed tomography to pause data acquisition during periods of irregular breathing.	
and desired during periods of irregular breathing	
and desired during periods of irregular breathing	using respiratory
ade or used in industry.	
	matter claimed c

NOTES TO FORM PCT/ISA/220 (continued)

The letter must indicate the differences between the claims as filed and the claims as amended. It must, in particular, indicate, in connection with each claim appearing in the international application (it being understood that identical indications concerning several claims may be grouped), whether

- (i) the claim is unchanged:
- (ii) the claim is cancelled;
- (iii) the claim is new:
- ((v) the claim replaces one or more claims as filed,
- (v) the claim is the result of the division of a claim as filed.

The following examples illustrate the manner in which amendments must be explained in the accompanying letter:

- [Where originally there were 48 claims and after amendment of some claims there are 51]: "Claims 1 to 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37 to 48 replaced by amended claims bearing the same numbers; claims 30, 33 and 36 unchanged; new claims 49 to 51 added."
- 2 [Where originally there were 15 claims and after amendment of all claims there are 11]: "Claims 1 to 15 replaced by amended claims 1 to 11.
- [Where originally there were 14 claims and the amendments consist in cancelling some claims and in adding new claims]:
 "Claims 1 to 6 and 14 unchanged, claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added." or
- "Claims 7 to 13 cancelled, new claims 15, 16 and 17 added; all other claims unchanged."
- Where various kinds of amendments are made]:
 "Claims 1-10 crichanged; claims 11 to 13, 18 and 19 cancelled; claims 14, 15 and 16 replaced by amended claim 14; claim 17 subdivided into amended claims 15, 16 and 17; new claims 20 and 21 added."

"Statement under Article 19(1)" (Rule 46.4)

The amendments may be accompanied by a statement explaining the amendments and indicating any impact that such amendments might have on the description and the drawings (which cannot be amended under Article 19(1)).

The statement will be published with the international application and the amended claims.

It must be in the language in which the international application is to be published.

It must be brief, not exceeding 500 words if in English or if translated into English.

It should not be confused with and does not replace the letter indicating the differences between the claims as filed and as amended. It must be filed on a separate sheet and must be identified as such by a heading, preferably by using the words "Statement under Article 19(1)."

It may not contain any disparaging comments on the international search report or the relevance of citations contained in that report. Reference to citations, relevant to a given claim, contained in the international search report may be made only in connection with an amendment of that claim

Consequence if a demand for international preliminary examination has already been filed

If, at the time of filing any amendments and any accompanying statement, under Article 19, a demand for international preliminary examination has already been submitted, the applicant must preferably, at the time of filing the amendments (and any statement) with the International Bureau, also file with the International Preliminary Examining Authority a copy of such amendments (and of any statement) and, where required, a translation of such amendments for the procedure before that Authority (see Rules 55.3(a) and 62.2, first sentence). For further information, see the Notes to the demand form (PCT/IPEA/401).

Consequence with regard to translation of the international application for entry into the national phase

The applicant's extention is drawn to the fact that, upon entry into the national phase, a translation of the claims as amended under Article 19 may have to be furnished to the designated/elected Offices, instead of, or in addition to, the translation of the claims as filed.

For further details on the requirements of each designated elected Office, see the PCT Applicant's Guide, Volume II.